- IN RE: PETITION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION * BEFORE THE NE/S Reisterstown Road, 152'
 - * DEPUTY ZONING COMMISSIONER (1507 Reisterstown Road) * OF BALTIMORE COUNTY 3rd Election District
 - 2nd Councilmanic District * Case No. 90-95-X
 - Crown Stations, Inc. Petitioners

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

* * * * * * * * * *

The Petitioners herein request a special exception to permit a food store with less than 5,000 sq.ft. as a use in combination with a gasoline service station in accordance ith Petitioner's Exhibit 1.

The Petitioners, by Bernard F. Mannion, Real Estate Division, and Michael P. Malone, Engineering Division, appeared, testified and were represented by Andrew Lapayowker, Esquire. Also appearing and testifying on behalf of the Petition was George Coppinger, Independent Operator for the subject property. There were no Protestants.

Testimony indicated that the subject property, known as 1507 Reisterstown Road, consists of .616 acres zoned B.L.-C.T., and is improved with a "Gas & Go" service station. Petitioners testified that in late 1971, early 1972, a Crown Service Station was built on the subject property as the property was then zoned B.L.-C.S.A. which permitted said improvements as of right. The comprehensive zoning maps process in 1980 reclassified the property to B.L.-C.C.C. and thereafter, in 1984, to B.L.-C.T. Petitioners concede as this is an individual site in a C.T. district, the site is not permitted to have a service station by right and/or by special exception under Section 405.2 of the B.C.Z.R. Petitioners are desirous of replacing the attendant kiosk with a new building consisting of 462 sq.ft. for use as a food store with an area for payment of gasoline purchases.

IVACROFILMED

site may not be a drastic enlargement or extension, the addition of a food mart is the addition of a new use. In my opinion the addition of a separate use, distinguishable from the nonconforming use as a second use, is not mere intensification.

Section 101 of the B.C.Z.R. defines "accessory use or structure" as follows:

> ... An ancillary use shall be considered as an accessory use; however, a use of such a nature or extent as to be permitted as a "use in combination" (with a service station) shall be considered a principal use. (underlining added)

Clearly, the proposed food store with less than 5,000 sq.ft. is a use in combination under the zoning regulations and said addition would consist of a second use and therefore a different use not permitted under McKemy and/or Section 405.8A. Petitioner's argument that the expansion is permitted under Sections 405.8A and 405.4C is rejected.

The Petitioners' second argument that the relief requested is appropriate based upon other cases in which the Zoning Commissioner and Deputy Zoning Commissioner have granted similar petitions is rejected. A review of the decisions rendered in each case indicates that in none of the cases was the issue specifically addressed. The Deputy Zoning Commissioner cannot grant relief which is not permitted under the zoning regulations. To do so would usurp the County Council's legislative powers which clearly is not the function of the Deputy Zoning Commissioner. The role of the Deputy Zoning Commissioner is to interpret and implement the B.C.Z.R. as enacted by the County Council.

"All parts of a statute are to be read together to find the intention as to any one part and that all parts are to be reconciled and harmoo a nized if possible. We have further said that a corolary to that rule is

Petitioners filed the instant Petition when the Office of Zoning raised the issue as to whether or not the site, which is located within the B.L.-C.T. zone, is permitted to add a food store with less than 5,000 sq.ft. of retail sales area since the service station is not permitted as of right or by special exception as currently zoned under the B.C.Z.R. Therefore, the service station use is a nonconforming use and as such, is governed by the requirements of Sections 104 and 405.8A of the Baltimore County Zoning Regulations (B.C.Z.R.). Petitioner contends that Section 405.8A permits as of right the expansion or construction of a gas station and any ancillary uses as listed in Section 405.4C. Section 405.8A states

> Notwithstanding other provisions of these Zoning Regulations to the contrary, any automotive-service station which legally existed on December 31, 1967 and which has not lost its permitted status by reason of the termination of a special exception applying thereto shall be governed by the provisions of the following paragraphs:

A. Subject to the provisions of Paragraph C, below, the main structure of any such automotive-service station may be expanded or reconstructed and any ancillary uses listed in paragraph 405.4.C may be added to any such establishment, provided that such station and all such expansion, reconstruction, or addition of uses: is either confined to the limits of the site as it existed on December 31, 1967 or to an expanded site as approved under Paragraph B...

Petitioner noted that while a food mart is not one of the permitted ancillary uses, a portion of Section 405.4C states that:

> ...Only uses listed in this Paragraph C or in Paragraph D (Uses in Combination with Service Stations) shall be permitted in conjunction with any service station regulated under this Subsection 405.4...

A food store with less than 5,000 sq.ft. is a use in combination under Section 405.4. The ancillary uses listed in Section 405.4C are permitted

on an LivieD

as of right with a service garage use, while uses in combination listed in Section 405.4.D5 are permitted only after a special exception hearing.

Subsequent to the hearing, Petitioner submitted a Memorandum of Law in support of i's position that the relief requested is proper. Petitioners' Memorandum rests on two arguments.

First, Petitioners contend "the conversion of the existing island attendant kiosks to a small express mart is at most, an intensification of an existing use and not a new or different use" and would be permitted under Section 104.1 of the B.C.Z.R. and the case law interpretation of nonconforming uses. Section 104.1 of the B.C.Z.R. states:

> A nonconforming use (as defined in Section 101) may continue except as otherwise specifically provided in these Regulations; provided that upon any change from such nonconforming use to any other use whatsoever, or any abandonment .r discontinuance of such nonconforming use for a period of one year or more, or in case any nonconforming business or manufacturing structure shall be damaged by fire or other casualty to the extent of seventy-five (75) percent of its replacement cost at the time of such loss, the right to continue or resume such nonconforming use shall terminate. No nonconforming building or structure and no nonconforming use of a building, structure, or parcel of land shall hereafter be extended more than 25% of the ground floor area of buildings so used.

As with all non-conforming use cases, the first task is to determine what lawful non-conforming use existed on the subject property. Petitioners have established that the property enjoys a nonconforming use Sas a service station.

The second principle to be applied, as specified in Section 104.1, is whether or not there has been a change or a change is proposed in the use of the subject property. A determination must be made as to whether or not the addition of the food mart is a different use, and therefore, not permitted as part of the service station non-conforming use. If

the evils or mischief sought to be remedied, Mitchell v. State, 115 Md. 360, 80 A.2d 1020 (1911); in other words, every statutory enactment must be considered in its entirety, and in the context of the purpose underlying (its) enactment, Giant of Md. v. State's Attorney, 267 Md. 501 at 509, 298 A.2d 427 at 432 (1973). Of course, a statute should be construed according to the ordinary and natural import of its language, since it is the language of the statute which constitutes the primary source for determining the legislative intent. Grosvenor v. Supervisor of Assess., 271 Md. 232, 315 A.2d 758 (1974); Height v. State, supra. Where there is no ambiguity or obscurity in the language of a statute, there is usually no need to look elsewhere to ascertain the intention of the Legislature. Purifoy v. Merc.-Safe Deposit & Trust, supra. Thus, where statutory language is plain and free from ambiguity and expresses a definite and sensible meaning, courts are not at liberty to disregard the natural import of words with a view towards making the statute express an intention which is different from its plain meaning. Gatewood v. State, 244 Md. 609, 224 A.2d 677 (1966). On the other hand, as stated in Maguire v. State, 192 Md. 615, 623, 65 A.2d 299, 302 (1949), '{a}dherence to the meaning of words does not require or permit isolation of words from their context'*** {since} the meaning of the plainest words in a statute may be controlled by the context... In construing statutes, therefore, results that are unreasonable, illogical or inconsistent with common sense should be avoided whenever possible consistent with the statutory language, with the real legislative

In applying these principles to the B.C.Z.R., particularly Sections 101 defining accessory use or structure, and Sections 405.4C and 405.8A, the conclusion is inescapable that under the plain wording of said Sections, the proposed food mart is a "use in combination" and principal use and therefore, not a permitted ancillary use.

intention prevailing over the intention indicated by the literal meaning. B. F. Saul Co. v. West End

Park, 250 Md. 707, 246 A.2d 591 (1968); Sanza v. Md. Board of Censors, 245 Md. 319, 226 A.2d 317 (1967);

Height v. State, supra.

In the past when the Office has concluded it has erroneously interpreted and implemented a particular section of the B.C.Z.R., it has corrected its action and enforced the regulations as enacted. This would

Whether or not the food mart use represents a permissible intensification of the nonconforming use or an actual change from the prior legal use must be examined. In order to decide whether or not the proposed food mart activity is within the scope of the non-conforming use, the following factors must be considered: "(a) To what extent does the current use of these lots reflect the nature and purpose of the original non-conforming use; (b) Is the current use merely a different manner of utilizing the original non-conforming use or does it constitute a use different in character, nature, and kind;

the food mart use is found to be different than the original use, the

proposed use of the property shall not be considered non-conforming. See

McKemy v. Baltimore County, Md., 39 Md. App.257, 385 A2d. 96 (1978).

(c) Does the current use have a substantially different effect upon the neighborhood;

(d) Is the current use a "drastic enlargement or extension" of the original non-conforming use."

McKemy v. Baltimore County, Md., Supra.

The facts of the case do not support Petitioners' argument that the addition of the food mart to the service station is permitted as "it is at most an intensification of an existing use and not a new or different use and/or an ancillary use listed in Section 405.4C." In 1970, Petitioners were granted a special exception for the use of the property as a service station. The zoning regulations are very clear that food stores and service stations are not one and the same use. The effect is clearly different as in all cases the zoning regulations require a special exception hearing in order to add a food store to an existing service station, whether or not the station and/or a food mart standing alone are permitted as of right in a particular zone. Although the physical change to the

> and/or Deputy Zoning Commissioner will correct past misinterpretations of the regulations. See In Re, C-F Properties Partnership, Case No. 85-113-SPHA. In that case, the then Zoning Commissioner, Arnold Jablon, reversed a long-standing policy of the Zoning Office which permitted both sides of a multi-faced business sign to be computed as one for the purpose of determining the size permitted. The language of Section 413.2 was found to clearly not support such an interpretation. In this instance, the proposed express mart as a use in combination with a service station is a principal use and not an ancillary use and/or accessory use. While an ancillary use and/or accessory use may be similar, Section 101 of the B.C.Z.R. clearly sets forth the distinction between a "use in combination" and ancillary use and/or accessory use. As indicated, the zoning regulations distinguish between ancillary uses and uses in combination with service stations. See Sections 101 and 405.4C and D of the B.C.Z.R. The fact that a food mart is permitted as of right in the B.L. zone, as noted by Petitioner, does not change the outcome. The County Council has distinquished between a food mart use standing alone and a use in combination. which is not permitted as of right but only when and where the service station is permitted, and then only after a special exception hearing. In this instance the service station use is not permitted. Therefore, the special exception criteria set forth in Section 502.1 of the B.C.Z.R. need

> not be the first and/or probably the last time the Zoning Commissioner

After reviewing all of the testimony and evidence presented, it appears that the Petition for Special Exception should be denied.

that if there is no clear indication to the contrary and it is reasonably possible, a statute is to be read so that no word, clause, sentence or phrase shall be rendered surplusage, superfluous, meaningless, or nugatory." See, e.g., Thomas v. State, 277 Md. 314, 317, 353 A.2d 256 (1376), and the cases there cited. Supervisor of Assess., Etc. v. Southgate Harbor, 279 Md. 586, 369 A.2d 1053 (1977).

The question here is one of construction of the B.C.Z.R. When interpreting the zoning regulations, the restrictive language contained must be strictly construed so as to allow the landowner the least restrictive use of his property. Mayor of Balto. v. Byrd, 62 A.2d 588 (1948); Lake Adventure, Inc. v. Zoning Hearing Bd. of Dingham Township, 440 A.2d 1284 (Pa.Comwlth., 1982). When the language of a zoning regulation is clear and certain, there is nothing left for interpretation and the ordinance must be interpreted literally. Mongony v. Bevilacqua, 432 A.2d 661 (R.I., 1981).

The meaning of the words in a statute may be controlled by the context. A statute should be so construed that all its parts harmonize with each other and render them consistent with its general object and scope. Pittman v. Housing Authority, 25 A.2d 466.

The basic principles of statutory construction were comprehensively set out by the Court of Appeals in State v. Fabritz, 276 Md. 416, 348 A.2d 275 (1975), cert. denied, 425 U.S. 942 (1976):

The cardinal rule in the construction of statutes is to effectuate the real and actual intention of the Legislature. Purifoy v. Merc. Safe Dep. & Trust, 273 Md. 58, 327 A.2d 483 (1974); Scoville Serv., Inc. v. Comptroller, 269 Md. 390, 306 A.2d 534 (1974); Height v. State, 225 Md. 251,170 A.2d 212 (1961). Equally well-settled is the principle that statutes are to be construed reasonably with reference to the purpose to be accomplished, Walker v. Montgomery County, 244 Md. 98, 223 A.2d 181 (1966), and in light of

MOTOFLYED

not be addressed.

Pursuant to the advertisement, posting of the property, and public hearing on this Petition held, and for the reasons given above, the relief requested in the special exception should be denied.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED by the Deputy Zoning Commissioner for day of February, 1990 that the Petition for Special Exception to permit a food store with less than 5.000 sq.ft. as a use in combination with a gasoline service station in accordance with Petitioner's Exhibit 1, be and is hereby DENIED.

> ANN M. NASTAROWICZ Deputy Zoning Commissioner for Baltimore County

respectively. Since this is an individual site in a CT district, the locational criteria listed in Subsection 405.2 would not be satisfied if this were an application for construction of a new station.

The conversion of the existing island house kiosks to small Express Marts is, at most, an intensification of an existing use and not a new or different use

The Baltimore County Zoning Regulations deal with nonconforming uses as rollows:

A nonconforming use (as defined in Section 101) may continue except as otherwise specifically provided in these Regulations; provided that upon any change from such nonconforming use to any other use whatsoever, or any abandonment or discontinuance of such nonconforming use for a period of one year or more, ... the right to continue or resume such nonconforming use shall terminate.

§ 104.1 (emphasis added).

A long line of Maryland cases has distinguished between an intensification of an existing use and an outright change to a new and different use. In Thillips v. Zoning Commissioner of Howard County, 225 Md. 102, 169 A.2d 410 (1961), the Court of Appeals considered the argument of a landowner who was trying to stretch a nonconforming second-hand furniture shop into a full-fledged junk yard. The Court explained the difference between a permissible intensification and an impermissible change in use:

While it is true that mere intensification of a nonconforming use is permissible so long as the nature of use is not substantially changed, it is generally recognized that the right of a landowner to continue the same kind of use to which the property was devoted on the critical date does not confer on him a right to subsequently change or add to that use a new and different one amounting to a drastic enlargement or extension of the prior existing use.

169 A.2d at 414 (emphasis added); see Jahnigen v. Staley, 245 Md. 130, 225 A.2d 169 A.2d ac.

The most comprehensive treatment of the question of nonconforming uses in Baltimore County is found in the case of McKemy v. Baltimore County, 39 Md. App. 257, 385 A.2d 96 (1978). The principal issue in McKemy was the status of a parking lot, and the types of vehicles that could be parked thereon. In remanding the case back to the County Board of Appeals, the Court set out the factors which determine whether a proposed use (the "current use" in the context of the McKemy case) is a permissible intensification or an impermissible change

PETITION FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTION

TO THE ZONING COMMISSIONER OF BALTIMORE COUNTY: The undersigned, legal owner(s) of the property situate in Baltimore County and which is described in the description and plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, hereby petition for a Special Exception under the Zoning Law and Zoning Regulations of Baltimore County, to use the

herein described property for _____ a food store with less than 5,000 square feet as a use in combination with a gasoline service station (Gas 'N' Go)

Property is to be posted and advertised as prescribed by Zoning Regulations

I, or we, agree to pay expen , of above Special Exception advertising, posting, etc., upon filing of this petition, and further agree to and are to be bound by the roning regulations and restrictions of Baltimore County adopted pursuant to the Zoning Law for Baltimore County.

I/We do solemnly declare and affirm, under the penalties of perjury, that I/we are the legal owner(s) of the property which is the subject of this Petition.

Legal Owner(s): Crown Stations, Inc. Contract Purchaser: William R. Snyder, Vice President/Administration (Type or Print Name) (Type or Print Name) (Type or Print Name) City and State Attorney for Petitioner: One North Charles 301-539-7400 Andrew Lapayowker Baltimore, MD 21201 Name, address and phone number of legal owner, con-One North Charles tract purchaser or representative to be contacted Baltimore, Maryland 21201 City and State Attorney's Telephone No.: _____

ORDERED By The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, this _____ day 19_{2} , that the subject matter of this petition be advertised, as required by the Zoning Law of Baltimore County, in two newspapers of general circulation throughout Baltimore County, that property be posted, and that the public hearing be had before the Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County in Room 106, County Office Building in Towson, Baltimore

Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore Count

(1) to what extent does the current use of these lots reflect the nature and purpose of the original non-conforming use; (2) is the current use merely a different manner of utilizing the

original non-conforming use or does it constitute a use different in character, nature, and kind;

(3) does the current use have a substantially different effect upon the neighborhood:

(4) is the current use a "drastic enlargement or extension" of the original non-conforming use.

385 A.2d at 104.

Under each of these tests, the charges proposed by Crown qualify as intensifications, and not changes.

1. Both before and after the proposed changes, the predominant and overriding use of all three properties would be a gasoline station. As shown, in part, by the zoning cases cited in the next section, convenience marts have become increasingly common at many gasoline stations. Many customers have come to expect such services.

2. The gasoline stations have always sold miscellaneous packaged goods, such as motor oil, transmission fluid, cigarettes, canned soda, etc., from the island kiosks. The proposed changes would result only in a structure that customers could enter to get out of the weather and that would be able to offer additional types of merchandise. The placement of the new structure under the canopy in the center of the station emphasizes to the public that the main purpose of the business continues to be the sale of gasoline. It is especially instructive that the Zoning Regulations refer to small food stores as "uses in combination" with gasoline stations, not as different or other uses.

3. The proposed use would have no substantial effect on the neighborhoods of the respective stations. If there is any effect, it would be the positive effect of providing additional convenience to neighborhood residents and employees. There was no opposition to any of the three petitions covered by this memorandum. It is also critical to note that each of these stations is located in a B.L. zone, which specifically permits "food stores" as a matter of right. § 230.9. The description of the C.C.C. and C.T. districts also seem to specifically encompass convenience food stores.

4. Perhaps the clearest aspect of Crown's proposed changes at these locations is that they cannot possibly be considered "drastic enlargement[s] or extension[s]" of the existing uses. The proposed Express Marts would fit almost

See §§ 259.2.C (C.C.C. district includes "shopping opportunities for convenience goods"), 259.2.D (C.T. district includes "pedestrian-oriented retail uses of a type ordinarily producing relatively high income and profit per square foot of sales area").

Crown Station MD-34 1507 Reisterstown Road Pikesville, MD 21208

ZONING DESCRIPTION

Located on the North East side of Reisterstown Road 152.15 southeast of Old Court Road and then running the following courses and distances; N 62° 39' 40"E 153.0'; thence S 41° 07' 46"E 167.99'; thence 8 47° 52' 33"W 143.07'; thence N 41° 34' 33"W 207.08'; to the point of the beginning.

entirely under the existing canopies, would not change the number of gasoline

pumps or islands, and would take up a very small portion of the existing lots

(approximately 1.3% at Reisterstown and Straw Hat; 1.7% at Reisterstown near Old

Court; and 1.9% at Loch Raven near Taylor). Virtually all of the cases cited

in section B below involved much larger food stores, some of which were located

permissible intensifications of existing nonconforming uses. They are not

Under the criteria in McKemy, Crown's proposed changes qualify as

The conclusion that these proposed changes are permissible is reinforced

by the other cases in which the Zoning Commissioner's office has granted

similar petitions for gasoline stations that are apparently nonconforming

Under Subsection 405.4.D.8, a food store with less than 5.000 square feet

Since 1967, and particularly within the last 4-5 years, oil companies have

of area is permitted as a use in combination with a service station provided

been developing existing and new sites with food stores with less than 5,000

square ft. as uses in combination with service stations. These food stores have

taken the form of new large to medium size free-standing stores, conversion of

part of service bays to retail areas and also the conversion of small free

standing kiosk buildings, usually on the pump island, to include some retail

sales. Many of these conversions and/or new structures have required zoning

hearings and the result and summary of those cases from 1985 that have a direct

been adopted for Baltimore County (i.e. 71, 76, 80, 84, and 88). With the

adoption of those comprehensive zoning maps, various properties, improved with

service stations, have had "conforming" districts superimposed over the existing

zoning, some have had "nonconforming" districts superimposed (i.e. zoning action

would be necessary to locate a service station on vacant land with this

zoning/district), others have had districts superimposed and then changed or

removed with subsequent maps, while still others have never had a district

clear that the proposed use was permitted in the applicable zone. This

petitioner located no case in which the Zoning Commissioner's office denied a

similar proposed use due to the apparently nonconforming status of the service

In several cases, the Zoning Commissioner specifically noted that it is

An explanation of various cases follows and, where available, copies of

Since the adoption of Bill 40, a number of comprehensive zoning maps have

bearing on this memorandum have been enumerated in the following pages.

in separate buildings, not under existing canopies.

a special exception is obtained.

superimposed at all.

Containing 26,834 square feet or .616 AC +.

Property also known as 1507 Reisterstown Road.

MECENTI MED



REISTERSTOWN S. OF OLD COURT

PETITIONS FOR SPECIAL EXCEPTIONS

SPECIAL HEARINGS, AND VARIANCES

LOCH RAVEN S. OF TAYLOR

REISTERSTOWN AND STRAW HAT

Petitioner, Crown Central Petroleum Corporation, hereby submits this Memorandum of Law in support of its petitions as indicated at the conclusion of each of the hearings in the three cases listed above. As requested, this memorandum addresses only the legal issues raised at those hearings regarding the appropriateness of adding a small food store (Express Mart) to existing Crown Service stations.

BEFORE THE

* ZONING COMMISSIONER

* OF BALTIMORE COUNTY

* Case No. 90-93-SPHX

* Case No. 90-94-SPHXA

* Case No. 90-95-X

PENDING CASES

In Case # 90-93-SPHX (Loch Raven near Taylor), the service station was granted a redistricting and special exception on 12/30/70 as a result of Case #70-229-RX. The redistricting changed the zoning from a B.L.-CCC to a B.L.-CSA district. Because this was an individual site in a CSA district and in accordance with Subsection 405.2.A.2, all requirements of this subsection were satisfied, and the existing use was constructed as a matter of right without requiring a public hearing. Subsequent to the aforementioned zoning hearing, the 1971 comprehensive zoning maps changed the zoning of the subject property, to its present B.L.-CCC classification. Consequently, if this were an application for a new service station on a vacant site, it would not satisfy the locational criteria for constructing a new service station as indicated by Subsection 405.2.

The service station in Case # 90-94-SPHXA (Reisterstown and Straw Hat) was granted a reclassification and special exception as a result of Case #5637-RX, which was granted on 9/27/62. The subject property is zoned B.L. with no district superimposed. Again, if this were a new service station on vacant land, it would not satisfy any of the locational criteria in Subsection 405.2.

In Case # 90-95-X (Reisterstown near Old Court), a review of the zoning records failed to find a previous hearing for the existing station. However, the zoning of the property from March 1971 to sometime in late 1980 was B.L.-CSA. In accordance with Subsection 405.2.A.2, the property satisfied the requirements of this subsection, and therefore, it was constructed after March 1971 and permitted as a matter of right without requiring a public hearing. With the adoption of succeeding comprehensive zoning maps in 1980 and 1984, the zoning was changed to B.L.-CCC and then to its present B.L.-CT zoning,

tellor ser it will

Case # 89-494-XSPH

Applicant - Exxor

Decision

Hearing was originally scheduled for June 7, 1989. However, the attorney for the petitioner by letter dated 5/30/89 requested a postponement until the CRG plan has been reviewed and comments addressed. The request is for special exception for a use in combination with a service station and a special hearing to amend the site plan.

Comments

This service station was granted a special permit on April 4, 1946 by Case

The current zoning of the property is B.R.-CS-1 and M.L.-CS-1. In accordance with Subsection 405.2.B.5, among other restrictions, on an individual site in a C.S.-1 district, a service station is permitted as a special exception site in a C.S.-1 district, a service station is permitted as a special exception if access is solely to a Class I commercial motorway. At this location, Pulaski Highway satisfies this criteria, but Ebenezer Road does not.

Even though as of this writing the petition still has not been heard it is included in this report. It is noteworthy that this case was processed by the zoning office with no adverse comments from said office or any other county agency, People's Counsel or the Director of Planning regarding a possible zoning

the opinions of the Zoning Office are attached as an Appendix.

AN CAROTHIMED

().-

Decision

On 5/23/89, the zoning commissioner granted a special exception for a car wash use on the subject property and a variance for sign area. It should be noted here that despite the fact that this is not a food store, a car wash as a use in combination with a service station must satisfy the same criteria as a food store as a use in combination.

Comments

The existing service station was granted a reclassification and special exception by the Board of Appeals on 2/14/63 as a result of Case #5693-RX.

The subject property is currently zoned B.L. with no district superimposed. In the opinion of the zoning commissioner he states "...it is clear that the B.C.Z.R. permits the use proposed in a B.L. zone by special exception."

MICROFILMED

Case #88-393-XA

Applicant - Independent Oil Station

Decision

On March 30, 1988, the zoning commissioner granted a special exception for a food store as a use in combination with a service station and a variance for lot area.

A Section 1

This service station was granted a reclassification and special exception on 6/28/61 as a result of Case #5305-RX.

The subject property is (was) zoned B.R. with no district superimposed and does not satisfy any of the locational criteria for constructing a new service station as indicated in Subsection 405.2.

Case #89-237-XSPH

Applicant - Shell Oil

Decision

On 1/20/89, the zoning commissioner granted a special hearing to prove a nonconforming use for a service station with parking in a residential zone and a special exception for a food mart, use in combination with the existing service

The existing service station was granted a reclassification and special exception on 5/8/58 as a sult of Case #4406-RX.

The subject property is (was) currently zoned B.R./D.R.5.5 with no district superimposed. In the opinion of the zoning commissioner, he states "...it is clear that the BCZR permits the proposed use in the B.R. and D.R.5.5 zones by special exception.

Of particular interest in this case is the fact that the service station was clearly noted as a nonconforming use and still the zoning office approved the food mart as a use in combination.

MICHARDAED

Case #88-298-XSPHA

Applicant - Amoco Oil

DECISION WAS STATED

On 2/22/88, the zoning commissioner granted a special exception for a food store and car wash as uses in combination with a service station, a special hearing to amend a previous site plan, and a variance for sign area. COMMENTS

This service station was granted a reclassification, special exception and variance on 2/21/61 as a result of Case #5214-RXA.

The subject property is (was) zoned B.L. with no district superimposed and does not satisfy any of the locational criteria for constructing a service station as indicated in Subsection 405.2.

It should be noted in this particular case, the special exception was for both a food store and a car wash (Subsection 405.4.D.4) as uses in combination.

Case #89-175-XA

Applicant - Amoco Oil

Applicant - AMOCO OIL

Decision

On 11/28/88, the zoning commissioner granted with restrictions a special exception for a gasoline station with a convenience store facility and variances for setback, sign and lot area.

Comments

Case #88-137-XA

result of Case #65-366-X.

AMCROSSI MED

Subsection 405.2.

DECISION

COMMENTS

The existing service station was granted a special exception on 2/19/59 as a result of Case #4460-X.

This property is(was) zoned B.L. with no district superimposed, and it does not satisfy any of the locational criteria in Subsection 405.2 for locating service stations on undistricted property.

In the opinion of the zoning commissioner, he states "it is clear that the BCZR permits the use proposed in a B.L. - CS-2 zone by special exception." As stated above, the property is (and was) undistricted. Even assuming, arguendo, that the description of the zoning is correct (i.e. B.L.-CS-2), the locational criteria listed in Substation 405.2.B.1 are still not satisfied.

Case #89-87-XA

DECISION

On 9/19/88, the deputy zoning commissioner granted a special exception for a gasoline service station in combination with a food store and a variance for sign area.

This service station was granted a special exception on 3/7/62 as a result of Case #5455-XA.

This property is (was) zoned B.M.-IM and under Subsection 405.2.B.6, a service station on an individual site cannot have direct access to an arterial street other than a Class I commercial motorway. In this location, Woodlawn Drive is a Class II commercial motorway. In the opinion of the deputy zoning commissioner, it is stated that "...it is clear that the B.C.Z.R. permits the use proposed in a B.M.-IM zone by special exception.

MILKING MEN

Case #85-278-XSPH

Applicant - ARCO

Applicant - TEXACO

DECISION

On 4/16/85, the deputy zoning commissioner granted a special hearing and special exception to convert an existing service station to a gas and go operation and for a use in combination with a service station and a variance for

COMMENTS

This service station was granted a special exception on 11/29/55 as a result of case #3667.

This property is (was) zoned B.L.-CCC, and under Subsection 405.2, there is no provision for locating a service station on an individual site in a CCC district. epito or the first

On 6/8/88, the Board of Appeals granted a special exception for a food

This service station was granted a special exception on 11/15/65 as a

The subject property is (was) zoned B.L. CS-2 and does not meet the

This decision was appealed by the petitioner who questioned two

locational criteria for constructing a service station as indicated in

restrictions in the order, and the protestants questioned the use in general,

but not the nonconforming status of the service station.

store as a use in combination and variance for sign area on appeal from the

decision of the zoning commissioner, who granted the request on 12/19/87.

Case law and the prior rulings of the Office of the Zoning Commissioner support this Petitioner's request for Special Exceptions to permit small Express Marts under the canopies at the three locations involved in these cases.

Under the criteria listed in the McKemy case and the other cases cited above, these Express Marts constitute an "intensification" of an existing service station use, not a "drastic enlargement or extension." The predominant use of these properties, both before and after the proposed changes would be as a gasoline station; the physical changes to the properties would be minimal; and the proposed convenience stores are specifically permitted in the zone applicable to all three locations

This interpretation of the 2 ning regulations and case law is entirely consistent with the numerous opinions of the Office of the Zoning Commissioner that have approved petitions to add convenience food stores to existing service stations in what are apparently nonconforming zones or districts. None of the case files, and none of the opinions reflect any adverse comments from the zoning office, the Director of Planning, People's Counsel, or any other county agency regarding a possible zoning

The Zuring Construction of Statistics County, by surveyly of the searing Act and Regulations of Believers County with told a patie hearing on the property identified hereing in Room 106 of the County Office Building, by saled at 111 W. Checaposite Account in Toy son, Maryland 21204 as foliants:

Pottern for Rescal Exception
Case mumbes 88-66-46.
NES Reinterstown Road,
1507 Reinterstown Road,
1507 Reinterstown Road,
250 Eaction District
550 Court-Readings
Potternor(s),
5 Court-Readon,
6 Sept. 18, 1000 at 2:00 p.m.
Exacted Exception: A Fuel
other with less than \$.000 square
light in \$1.50 combination with
a geneting Aprecia station (Gen
6 So).

ROBERT HANES

Zoning Commissioner of
Butterens County

Respectfully submitted,

Andrew Lapayowker P.O. Box 1168 Baltimore, MD 21203

301-659-4834 Attorney for Crown Central Petroleum Corporation

CERTIFICATE OF PUBLICATION

TOWSON, MD., _____ August 29 , 1989 THIS IS TO CERTIFY, that the annexed advertisement was published in THE JEFFERSONIAN, a weekly newspaper printed and published in Towson, Baltimore County, Md., appearing on lugest 24 19.89

THE JEFFERSONIAN,

price \$ 39.40

CERTIFICATE OF POSTING

Location of property NE sule of Reistratown Roal, 152 5 E of

Location of Signe Alm front of 1507 Ristratown Road

Location of Signe Alm front of 1507 Ristratown Prod

Posted by ______ Quests

Case #85-56-X

Applicant - SHELL

DECISION

On 8/30/84, the zoning commissioner granted a special exception for a food store as a use in combination with a service station.

MICROFILIMED

APPENDIX

PETITIONER(S) SIGN-IN SHEET

ANDREW LARAYOWKER WON POBOX 1168 BACTURORE 21203

Michael P. Malone - en P.O. By 1168 BACTURORE 21203

GEORGE CoppINGER Opensol 1507 Reisterstimm Rd 21207

Bernsed F NJAMESTERSTIMM Rd 21207

(Exit 20 off 695, across from Hillon)

\$4 admission/refreshments

(A for Davish Marketing)

The offices of the Northwest Star will be moving on Wed., Aug. 30 to: 17 Warren Rd., Suite 12-B (Williamsburg Square) Phone number will be the

Same: 653-3800.

LIBERTY WEST APARTMENTS

Window in Kitchen and Bath for Added Light and Ventiletion • Hot and Cold Water Included in Rent • Plenty of Spacious Closets • Ample Storage and Laundry Facilities in Each Building • Pre-Wired for Cable • Step Save Kitchens • 14-hour Emergency Maintenance • On-Site Management

APARTMENTS AVAIL, FOR LEASING

Rental Office: 922-3683

Get into shape

close to home.

• Aerobics

dryer,

• Much, much more Families with incomes between \$17,000 and

\$33,000 given special consideration.

Models open Mon. thru Sat. 10 to 6. Sun. 1 to 6. DIRECTIONS: Of McDonogh

Road in Owings Mills.

PHONE: (301)

• Full size washer and •

Mon.-Sat. 9 A.M. 5 P.M.

Bring a friend - BE THERE!

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

. REAL ESTATE

ALL GOVERNMENT SEIZED:

Homosylver \$1.00. You repair. For foreclosure information, 1-404-666

MOTIOE OF HEARING

Petition for Spacial Exception
CASE MAMBER 30-95-X
Relationstown Road, 152 SE of Old Count Put.
1507 Relationstown Road
3rd Election District 2 and Councilmant,
Putitioner(s): Cream Seatons, Inc.
Familia SCHEDILLED: Tuesday, Sept. 15, 1080
at 2:00 p.m.

Special Enception: A Food store with tree than 5:000 requery feet or a view in combination with a few generate cervice station (Gas. 1/2 Co.).

In the event that this Pottion is graned, a building permit may be issued within the thirty (30) day appeal period. The Zoning Commissioner will, however, entertain any request for a stay of the issuence of staid permit during this period for good dames shows. Such request study be in willing and executed in this office by the date of the insuring set above or presented at the hearing.

the adjustment of the

J. ROBERT HAINES
Zoning Commissioner of
Baltimore County

Workshops for Small Businesses

The Maryland Small Business

Development Financing Authority (MSBDFA) of the Department of Economic and Employment Development (DEED) is sponsoring a series of three-day seminars on 'Preparing for Mega-Succes' and a series of one-day workshops entitled 'MSBDFA Financing Symposium' at four locations

ing Symposium at four locations throughout the state for small business

throughout the state for small business entrepreneurs.

The Prejuting for Mega-Success seminars, to be conducted by the cernified public accounting farm of Bennett, light and Company, will be held in History, July 20-22; Salisbury, Ang. 19; Baltimore, September 14-14, 1989, The seminars are being sheld to help participants strengthen their understanding of bosic business operating methods, techniques and accepted.

Persons interested in attending either the three-day seminar or the one-day symposium acheduled for Hagerstown in July most register with MSRDPA by July 10. A \$100 non-refundable pre-registration fee in re-

MSBDFA By July 10. A \$100 conretundable pre-registration fee in required to staced the seminar. The fee
for the symposium is \$15.

To obtain a registration application,
consact MSBDFA at 217 E. Redwood

St., June 2240, Bako, MD or call 333-4270

This service station was granted a special exception and variance on 4/9/63 as a result of Case #5816-XA.

The subject property is (was) zoned B.M.-CCC, and under Subsection 405.2 there is no provision for locating a service station on an individual site in a CCC district.

Crown Stations, Inc.

One North Charles Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Re: Petition for Special Exception CASE NUMBER: 90-95-X NES Reisterstown Road, 152' SE of Old Court Road 1507 Reisterstown Road

3rd Election District - 2nd Councilmanic Petitioner(s): Crown Stations, Inc. HEARING SCHEDULED: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1989 at 2:00

Gentleman:

Please be advised that \$ 85.40 is due for advertising and posting of the above captioned property.

THIS FEE MUST BE PAID AND THE ZONING SIGN & POST SET(S)

RETURNED ON THE DAY OF THE HEARING OR THE ORDER SHALL NOT ISSUE.

UNTIL THE DAY OF THE HEARING.

County Office Build-Maryland fifteen (15)

OFFICE OF FINANCE - REVENUE DIVISION MISCELLANEOUS CASH RECEIPT

& post set(s), there int for each such set

VALIDATION OR SIGNATURE OF CASHIER DISTRIBUTION
WHITE - CASHIER PINK - AGENCY YELLOW - CUSTOMER

Baltimore County Zoning Commissioner Office of Planning & Zoning Towson, Maryland 21204 (301) 887-3353

J. Robert Haines Zoning Commissioner

August 8, 1989

NOTICE OF HEARING

Dennis F. Rasmussen
County Executive The Zoning Commissioner of Baltimore County, by authority of the Zoning Act and Regulations of Baltimore County will hold a public hearing on the property identified herein in Room 106 of the County Office Building, located at 111 W. Chesapeake Avenue in Towson, Maryland as

Petition for Special Exception CASE NUMBER: 90-95-X NES Reisterstown Road, 152' SE of Old Court Road 1507 Reisterstown Road 3rd Election District - 2nd Councilmanic Petitioner(s): Crown Stations, Inc. HEARINC SCHEDULED: TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 19, 1989 at 2:00 p.m.

Special Exception: A Food store with less than 5,000 square feet as a use in combination with a gasoline service station (Gas 'N' Go).

In the event that this Petition is granted, a building permit may be issued within the thirty (30) day appeal period. The Zoning Commissioner will, however, entertain any request for a stay of the issuance of said permit during this period for good cause shown. Such request must be in writing and received in this office by the date of the hearing set above or pre-

MADROFILMED

J. Robert Haines J. ROBERT HAINES ZONING COMMISSIONER BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

cc: Crown Stations, Inc. Andrew Lapayowker, Esq.

Baltimore County Zoning Commissioner
Office of Planning & Zoning Towson, Maryland 21204 (301) 887-3353 J. Robert Haines
Zoning Commissioner

Please make your check payable to Baltimore County, Maryland. Bring the BALTIMORE COUNTY, MARYLAND

R-001-615-000

FOR: P+A /2 9/19/89 (see: 90-95 X)

B B 103******8540:a 520%F



Richard H. Trainor Hal Kassoff

June 21, 1989

Mr. J. Robert Haines Zoning Commissioner County Office Building Towson, Maryland 21204 Att: James Dyer

Re: Baltimore County Crown Stations, Inc. Zuning meet. 6/27/89 N/S Reisterstown Road MD 140 152' east of Old Court Road

Item #526

Dear Mr. Haines:

After reviewing the submitta of a Special Exception for a food store with less than 5,000 sc are feet as a use in combination with a gasoline service station, we find the plan must be revised to show a future 80' right-of-way on Reisterstown

If you have any questions, contact Larry Brocato (333-1350).

Very truly yours,

Creston J. Mills, Jr. Chief Engineering Access Permits Division

co: Crown Central Petroleum Mr. J. Ogle



ZONING OFFICE

My telephone number is (301) 333-1350-

FAX #333-1041

Teletypewriter for impaired Hearing or Speech
383-7555 Baltimore Metro - 565-0451 D.C. Metro - 1-800-492-5062 Statewide Toll Free
707 North Calvert St., Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0717

Baltimore County Fire Department 800 York Road Towson, Maryland 21204-2586 (301) 887-4500 Paul H. Reincke

JUNE 26, 1989

J. Robert Haines Zoning Commissioner Office of Planning and Zoning Baltimore County Office Building Towson, MD 21204

RE: Property Owner:

CROWN STATIONS, INC.

Location:

#1507 REISTERSTOWN ROAD

Item No.: 526

Zoning Agenda: JUNE 27, 1989

Gentlemen: Pursuant to your request, the referenced property has been surveyed by this Eureau and the comments below are applicable and required to be corrected or incorporated into the final plans for the property.

Pire hydrants for the referenced property are required and shall be located at intervals of 300 feet intervals along an approved road in accordance with Baltimore County Standards as published by the Department of Public Works.

4. The site shall be made to comply with all applicable parts of the Fire Prevention Code prior to occupancy or beginning of operation.

ALL SELF-SERVICE STATIONS SHALL HAVE 1 ATTENDENT ON DUTY WHILE THE STATION IS OPEN TO THE PUBLIC. THE ATTENDANT'S PRIMARY FUNCTION SHALL BE TO SUPERVISE, OBSERVE, AND CONTROL THE DISPENSING OF CLASS I LIQUIDS, WHILE ACTUALLY BEING DISPENSED. NFPA 30,1987 ED., SEC 7-8.4.3 AND SEC. 7-8:4.4.

5. The buildings and structures existing or proposed on the site shall comply with all applicable requirements of the National Fire Protection Association Standard No. 101 "Life Safety Code", 1988 edition prior to occupancy.

Fire Prevention Bureau Planning Group Special Inspection Division

JK/KEK

MICHUFILMEN

Baltimore County Department of Public Works Bureau of Traffic Engineering Courts Building, Suite 405 Towson, Maryland 21204 (301) 887-3554

Mr. J. Robert Haines

Zoning Commissioner

Towson, MD 21204

County Office Building

July 24, 1989





Dear Mr. Haines:

The Bureau of Traffic Engineering has no comments for items number 525, 527, 542, 543, 544, 545, 546, 547, 548, 549, 550, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 557, 558 and 559.

Traffic Engineer Associate II

BALTIMORE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL ROTECTION AND RESOURCE MANAGEN T



Zoning Commissioner Office of Planning and Zoning County Office Building Towson, Maryland 21204

Zouing Item # 526, Zoning Advisory Committee Meeting of June 27 1989

Property Owner: Crown Stations Inc.

Location: 1507 Reistenstown Road

District:

District: _ 3 COMMENTS ARE AS FOLLOWS:

Prior to approval of a Building Permit for construction, renovation and/or installation of equipment work many and specifications must be submitted. to the Plans Review Section, Bureau of Regional Community Services, for final review and approval.

() Prior to new installation(s) of fuel burning equipment, the owner shall contact the Bureau of Air Quality Management, 887-3775, to obtain requirements for such installation(s) before work begins. () A permit to construct from the Bureau of Quality Management is required for such items as spray paint

process which exhausts into the atmosphere. () A permit to construct from the Bureau of Air Quality Management is required for any charbroiler generation which has a total cooking surface area of five (5) square feet or more.

processes, underground gasoline storage tank(s) (5,000 gallons or more) and any other equipment or

Prior to approval of a Building Permit Application for renovations to existing or construction of new health care facilities, complete plans and specifications of the building, food service area and type of equipment to be used for the food service operation must be submitted to the Plans Review and Approval Section, Division of Engineering and Maintenance, State Department of Health and Mental Hygiene for review and approval.

Prior to any new construction or substantial alteration of public swimming pool, wading pool, bathhouse, saunas, whirlpools, hot tubs, water and sewerage facilities or other appurtenances pertaining to health and safety; two (2) copies of plans and specifications must be submitted to the Baltimore County Department of Environmental Protection and Resource Management for review and approval. For more complete information, contact the Water Quality Monitoring Section, Bureau of Regional Community Services, 687-6500 x 315.

Prior to approval for a nursery school, owner or applicant must comply with all Baltimore County regulations For more complete information, contact the Division of Maternal and Child Health.

If lubrication work and oil changes are performed at this location, the method providing for the elimination of waste oil must be in accordance with the State Department of the Environment.

Prior to razing of existing structure(s), petitioner must contact the Division of Waste Management at 887-3745, regarding removal and/or disposal of potentially hazardous materials and solid wastes. Petitioner must contact the Bureau of Air Quality Management regarding removal of asbestoes, 887-3775.

· () Any abandoned underground storage tanks containing gasoline, waste oil, solvents, etc., must have the contents removed by a licensed hauler and tank removed from the property or properly backfilled. Price to removal or abandonment, owner must contact the Division of Waste Management at 887-3745.

Soil percolation tests, have been ____, must be ____, conducted.

() The results are valid until ____.

() Soil percolation test results have expired. Petitioner should contact the Division of Water and Sewer to determine whether additional tests are required.

() Where water wells are to be used as a source of water supply, a well meeting the minimum Baltimore County Standards must be drilled.

() In accordance with Section 13-117 of the Baltimore County Code, the water well yield test

() shall be valid until () is not acceptable and must be retested. This must be accomplished prior to conveyance of property and approval of Building Permit Applications.

Prior to occupancy approval, the potability of the water supply must be verified by collection of bacteriological and chemical water samples.

) If submission of plans to the County Review Group is required, a Hydrogeological Study and an Environmental fects Report must be submitted. For more information contact the Division of Environmental Management

() In order to subdivide this property, the owner or developer will be required to comply with the subdivision regulations of the State of Maryland and Baltimore County. If there are any questions regarding the subdivision process, please contact the Land Development Section at 887-2762.

BALTIMORE COUNTY, HARYLAND

INTER-OFFICE CORRESPONDENCE

Al Wirth - SWM DATE: August 17, 1989 Bob Bowling - Dev. Eng. (3) Frank Fisher - Current Planning Rahim Famili - Traffic Engineering Rocky Powell - DEPRM Larry Pilson - DEPRM

Dave Flowers - DEPRM Carl Richards - Zoning Capt. Kelly - Fire Department Pat Kincer - Rec. & Parks Chuck Weiss - Sanitation Larry Brocato - SHA

Susan Wimbley

Bureau of Publi Services

SUBJECT: Crown - 1507 Reisterstown Road Crown Central

MICROFILMED

539-7400 W-88-261

The subject property was granted a waiver of CRG meeting by the Office of Planning & Zoning. However, CRG approval signatures must

Please review the attached plan for concurrance with current development regulations and give us your approval or comments by September 1,-1989. Nonresponsiveness by the aforementioned date is considered to be concurrance by your office of the plan.

Attachment

cc: File

(SEE OTHER SIDE FOR COMMENTS)

Zoning Office records do not indicate that a special exception hearing for the service station use has ever been granted. If this is the case, the fact that the site is now within a B.L.-C.T. district establishes that the current use status of the service station is nonconforming and, therefore, no change in use or any substantial enlargement is permitted. (S.104, BCZR) SEE REVISED COMMENTS

If the service station site can comply with S.405.2.B.4 (B.C.Z.R.) and meet the standards of S.405.5 and other applicable requirements of S.405, a special exception for the service station can be requested, along with the use in combination.

Planning & Zoning Associate III

REVISED COMMENTS. 9/11/89. PLAN RETURNED TO PUBLIC SERVICES.
COMPLANCE WITH ALL REQUIREMENTS OF 5.405 MUST BE SHOWN ON THE PLAN PRIOR TO MARCHAL.

In addition to the hearings proposed on the plan, a Special Hearing will he required to determine if the use in combination is permitted under S.405.8 as it references S.405.4.C (B.C.Z.R.).





